

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0130576 to Fujita et al. ("*Fujita*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0040962 to Lewis ("*Lewis*") and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0108656 to Wu et al. ("*Wu*").

Applicants add new dependent claims 10-12. Claims 1-12 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujita*, *Lewis*, and *Wu*.

Independent claim 1 recites an information processing apparatus including changing means for "changing a size of operation buttons[,] . . . the operation buttons displayed superimposed on the images before and after the change in the aspect ratio." Combinations of *Fujita*, *Lewis*, and *Wu* fail to teach or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

With respect to *Fujita*, Figure 9 discloses a source image display screen 52 and an operation button image screen 51. Source image display screen 52 is compressed and moved in order to make room for operation button image screen 51. *Fujita*, ¶ [0047].

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that, in *Fujita*, "button sizes are different depending on the amount of available area 51 has[,] as can be seen in Figs. 6 and 7." But Figures 6 and 7 of *Fujita* only disclose different locations for operation buttons, which are located on top in Figure 6 and on the side in Figure 7. *Fujita*, ¶¶ [0042]-[0043]. The operation buttons in Figures 6 and 7 are not noticeably

different in size, and *Fujita* does not state that the operation buttons in Figures 6 and 7, or anywhere else, are different in size. For at least these reasons, *Fujita* provides no teaching or suggestion for “changing a size of operation buttons,” as recited in claim 1.

Lewis and *Wu* fail to remedy the deficiencies of *Fujita* by also failing to teach or suggest “changing a size of operation buttons[,] . . . the operation buttons displayed superimposed on the images before and after the change in the aspect ratio,” as recited in claim 1.

Notwithstanding the above, which is sufficient for the allowance of independent claim 1, claim 1 further recites that:

when the operation button is continuously operated before and after the detection of the change in aspect ratio and the predetermined process is a continuous process, the generating means generates a command to perform the predetermined process while the operation button is operated, regardless of another operation button operated after the detection of the change in aspect ratio.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner appears to concede that *Fujita* fails to disclose these features of claim 1, and instead relies on *Lewis*.

Lewis discloses recording a broadcasted program, and pausing, stopping, and rewinding the broadcasted program while it is being recorded. *Lewis*, ¶ [0026]. This does not constitute or suggest “when the operation button is continuously operated[,] . . . generat[ing] a command to perform the predetermined process while the operation button is operated,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). There is no evidence in *Lewis* that any “operation button” of the recording “is continuously operated,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added), when the pausing, stopping, and rewinding takes place. *Lewis*, ¶ [0026].

Wu fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Fujita* and *Lewis* by also failing to teach or suggest "when the operation button is continuously operated before and after the detection of the change in aspect ratio and the predetermined process is a continuous process, the generating means generates a command to perform the predetermined process while the operation button is operated, regardless of another operation button operated after the detection of the change in aspect ratio," as recited in claim 1.

For at least each of the above discussed reasons, combinations of *Fujita*, *Lewis*, and *Wu* fail to teach or suggest claim 1. Independent claims 2-6, while of different scope than claim 1, distinguish over *Fujita*, *Lewis*, and *Wu* for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Claims 7-9 and new claims 10-12 distinguish over *Fujita*, *Lewis*, and *Wu* at least due to their dependence from one of the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 18, 2010

By: 

Fahd Hussein Patel
Reg. No. 61,780
(202) 408-6072